

## REMARKS

Claims 3, 4, 7, and 9-14 are now in the case. Claims 1, 2, 5, 6, and 8 have been canceled without prejudice. Canceled claims 1, 5, and 6 have been rewritten as new claim 9, with dependent claims 3, 4, and 7 depending from this new claim. Independent claim 10 and its dependent claims 11-14 have been added to provide claims of varying scope. No new matter has been added in combining or adding claims.

Claims 1, 2, 7, and 8 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as anticipated by the U.S. patent to Artenian No. 5,265,805. Claims 1, 2, and 8 have been canceled, and claim 7 now depends from new claim 9. Accordingly, it is submitted that this rejection based on Section 102 of the Patent Statute is now moot.

Claims 3-6 were rejected as being unpatentable over Artenian under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a). This rejection is respectfully traversed. It is true that Artenian is directed to high-pressure cleaning apparatus with rotatable nozzles and diffuser plates where the plates are positioned on the left and right side of the cleaning head. However, claim 9 is not limited to such structure.

Claim 9 recites, inter alia, a particular type of diffuser, namely, a perforated sheet, in which perforations are graduated in size, decreasing in size toward the outside of the cleaning head. As taught on page 8 of the subject application, this structure provides a graduated porosity or pass-through characteristic that would decrease toward the outer edge of the skirt portion 20. This concept is not taught or even suggested in the Artenian disclosure, leaving no foundation upon which to conclude that the claimed structure of claims 9 and its dependent claims 3, 4, and 7 would be obvious to a skilled artisan.

Claims 10-14 also distinguish over Artenian not only for the reasons set forth above regarding claim 14 but also because Artenian fails to disclose structure set out in independent claim 10. For example, Artenian fails to show a housing having a first top wall, a cleaning chamber within the housing and having a second top wall, and a suction manifold formed between the first top wall and the second top wall with ports in the cleaning chamber in communication with the suction manifold. Accordingly, Artenian does not anticipate nor does it make obvious claims 10-14.


Reconsideration and allowance of claims 3, 4, 7, and 9-14 are earnestly solicited.

Please grant any extensions of time required to enter this response and charge any additional required fees to our deposit account 06-0916.

Respectfully submitted,

FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW,  
GARRETT & DUNNER, L.L.P.  
1300 I Street, NW  
Washington, DC 20005  
(202) 408-4000

Dated: April 15, 2004

By:   
Tipton D. Jennings  
Reg. No. 20,645